

# Medicine Bow Landscape Vegetation Analysis (LaVA)

## Meeting Minutes

**Cooperating Agencies Meeting**  
**April 18, 2018; 9:30 am – 3:00 pm**  
**In person or VTC**

### In Attendance:

Aaron Voos  
Brian Hall  
Brian Lovett  
Carson Engelskirger  
Chris Jones  
Justin Williams  
Larry Hicks  
Leanne Correll  
Mark Conrad  
Melissa Martin  
Russ Bacon  
Kelle Reynolds

Frank Romero  
Josh Peck  
Corey Class  
Ryan Amundson  
Lisa Solberg-Schwab  
Tim Douville  
Martin Curry  
Liz D’Arcy  
Travis Pardue  
Doug Myhre  
Melissa Martin

### ACTION ITEMS:

- FS to combine three separate Implementation Framework Appendices into a single appendix; provide a comprehensive discussion of how implementation will work and define the roles of the FS, cooperating agencies, and the public.
- April 23, 2018 – Leanne Correll to provide draft of comprehensive framework diagram to FS.
- FS is to upload LaVA Specialist Reports onto the CloudVault site for cooperating agency review in lieu of DEIS Chapter 3. *Comments will be due two weeks after cooperators are notified of report availability.*

### AGENDA TOPICS:

#### 1. Forest Supervisor Time

##### DISCUSSION

Welcome. Appreciate assistance on the Implementation Appendix Small Groups. There is a lot of work still to accomplish and cooperator support is invaluable. The Implementation appendices are a contract, so to speak, and are crucial to successful implementation. Russ has been working with the Saratoga Mill post-fire. We need industry to help implement and make LaVA successful.

#### 2. Cooperating Agency - Adaptive Implementation and Monitoring Framework

##### PROCESS OVERVIEW

Small Group – Melissa, Leanne Correll, Justin Williams, and Mark Conrad. Used SBEADMR Appendix E – Public Engagement as starting point and modified to be specific to cooperating agency roles throughout LaVA implementation. Developed a 9-Step Process from start to finish (depicted diagram). Dynamic process, meaning that several projects could be at different steps at different times depending on the implementation cycle.

## DISCUSSION

**Question:** How will the implementation team be determined? **Response:** Implementation teams would likely consist of the LaVA Core team plus extended team members, as appropriate.

**General Comment** – Watch for inconsistent language between the three implementation appendices (e.g. public comment v. *public feedback and input*) and provide a glossary of terms for words like NGO, stakeholder, cooperating agency, and so on.

**Introduction – Adaptive Management definition:** Cite authorities in addition to HFRA, like the Farm Bill NFMA, MB Plan and MUSYA. Indicate ‘framework’ is dynamic – developed to ensure collaborative implementation – and could be changed to augment implementation success. Indicate ‘framework’ is intended to address most implementation cycles but that there may be instances wherein projects are advanced outside of the cycle due to such things as unanticipated funding or increased workforces.

**Treatment Identification:** Example - WGFD may not follow FS methodology in conducting surveys, but their expertise would be accepted if it aligns with FS protocols.

**Step 5 – Public Engagement** (ties in with Public Engagement Appendix) – This Step is too prescriptive and should refer to the Public Engagement appendix rather than defining specific actions. Distinguish between engagement activities for pre-treatment actions v. post-treatment (monitoring). **Public**

**Engagement Suggestions:** Host an annual meeting, at the same general time of year, focusing on what’s proposed for the following year, what to anticipate in the out-years (3-5 years), and what’s been implemented. This structured meeting time/format would help to instill public trust that there will be an opportunity to engage throughout LaVA implementation. It would also help the FS and Cooperators to get into a scheduled workflow. Consider funding cycles in determining when meetings are hosted so that we don’t miss funding opportunities.

## CONCLUSION

If a decision is made to retain the three Implementation appendices rather than combine them into a single appendix (see below), reconvene the small group and address the comments and suggestions that were identified in the meeting.

### 3. Public Engagement - Adaptive Implementation and Monitoring Framework

## PROCESS OVERVIEW

Small Group – Aaron Voos, Brian Lovett, Larry Hicks, and Dena Egenhoff.

**Public Engagement Updates** – Dr. Dennis Knight published an informed article in the paper encouraging public engagement (emailed to cooperators on 4/18). Melissa made a presentation to the Audubon Society.

Process Outline – Meetings with small group to brainstorm ideas; combined ideas into draft document for review; edited into the document presented during the meeting. Developed like a communication plan and includes clear, concise, bullets rather than a step-by-step process.

## DISCUSSION

**General Comments:** Review language referencing ‘input/feedback periods’ to ensure we’re distinguishing between pre and post-treatment opportunities and that we’re not locking ourselves into specific timeframes. Although our intent it not to produce a ‘response to comments’ of sorts, we do want to demonstrate responsiveness. This can be accomplished through the annual report that will be published to the project webpage and/or story map.

## CONCLUSION

Review appendix against other appendices to ensure consistent verbiage. Edit language that infers a formal response might be provided. Demonstrate responsiveness in the annual reporting.

### 4. Forest Service - Adaptive Implementation and Monitoring Framework

## PROCESS OVERVIEW

Small Group – Liz D’Arcy, Michael Salazar, Carson Engelskirger, and Bret Callaway  
Used SBEADMR Appendix D (Annual Treatment Review) as their starting point and streamlined process for LaVA. They developed a step-by-step process similar to that described in the cooperator appendix, but specific to internal FS operations.

## DISCUSSION

The FS needs to better define their idea of an implementation cycle; otherwise, it’s difficult to integrate how cooperating agencies and the public will engage. Suggestion: Synthesize the three appendices into one so that we can present the broad picture and then get into detail about how the three ‘entities’ would participate throughout the various ‘steps.’ Presenting the information in three different locations makes it difficult to understand the cyclic implementation cycle and how it’s intended to work.

## CONCLUSION

The FS is to combine the three appendices into a single framework.

### 5. LaVA Draft EIS – Chapter 2 Overview and Suggested Edits

## DISCUSSION

**General Comments:** The chapter needs to be streamlined; there’s a lot of repetition and sections need to be moved to make the information flow better. Make sure that the document is written for a public audience. Double-check numbers and terminology for consistency. Change TOA labels to reflect full suite and limited suite of tools. Include photos in silvicultural matrix even if repetition is necessary.

## CONCLUSION

Melissa and Chris will work to incorporate suggested edits into DEIS chapter 2.

### 6. Meeting Wrap-up

## DISCUSSION

**DEIS Chapter 3** – Cooperators agreed to review Specialist Reports in lieu of reviewing draft chapter 3 so as to expedite DEIS preparation. Specialist Reports will be uploaded onto the CloudVault site. Cooperators will have two weeks to review and provide comments on the reports.

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, May 16<sup>th</sup>

**Meeting adjourned.**